

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

PIN	5276	COUNTY	Multiple Counties
APPLICANT	San Benito County Water District	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$500,000
PROJECT TITLE	Pajaro River Watershed Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$872,220

#### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Preserve the economic and environmental wealth and well-being of the Pajaro River watershed through watershed stewardship and comprehensive management of water resources in a practical, cost effective, and responsible manner.

**WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.**

**Score: 12**

**Comment:** This proposal provides a well defined work plan, budget and schedule. Tasks are described in the work plan text but the budget does not provide any supporting documentation indicating who will do the work. Also, a break down of costs is not included and the charge rates are not provided. It's not clear if the IRWP will be adopted by January 1, 2007, since the schedule does not address adoption. Procedures should be incorporated into the planning process to acquire agreements to identify roles, responsibilities, coordination, scheduling, funding, maintenance, etc.

**DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** The application describes the region, including various water supplies, flooding, land use, environmental, and cultural issues. The description is fairly inclusive; however, the IRWMP region and location of the proposed implementation projects were not shown on any map, but instead will be developed for IRWMP recommended strategy.

**OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 10**

**Comment:** Water supply, water quality, flood protection, and environmental goals are clearly stated and were developed through a consensus based approach. The goals and objectives address regional issues and include potential conflicts. The IRWMP will address conflicts as one of the work plan tasks.

**INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 8**

**Comment:** Water management strategies are integrated into and throughout the proposed IRWMP. These strategies include water supply, flood management, groundwater management, environmental considerations, and multi-purpose strategies. The applicant; however, did not demonstrate how water management strategies will be integrated other than by consensus. The water management strategies will meet IRWM standards if they are implemented.

**IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 6**

**Comment:** A general schedule for implementation is discussed. The IRWMP will develop an implementation plan for recommended strategies and projects. It will include feasibility studies, design and construction, and CEQA compliance. A "Collaborative" will continue to meet after adoption of the IRWMP to provide progress updates and to provide a forum for on-going planning. It does not discuss how IRWMP projects or objectives that cross jurisdictional boundaries will be implemented. The IRWMP does not include a structure to ensure implementation. A selected project will be the basis for an implementation grant; however, funding is listed as a major hurdle for implementation. Monitoring the performance of the planning grant will be through reports. NPS projects are not addressed.

**IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.**

**Score: 8**

**Comment:** The application lists a few potential benefits and states that implementation of existing and planned projects will receive impact analysis under CEQA. Potential impacts will be identified through CEQA or NEPA during project implementation. More detail is needed on the impacts discussion.

## PROPOSAL EVALUATION

### *Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant*

**DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 3**

**Comment:** Although available data adequately supports the proposed planning and numerous technical studies have been completed, are on-going, or will be proposed, detailed and specific data and technical analysis components for integrated regional projects is not addressed. No meaningful details are supplied.

**DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** The plan includes ongoing efforts to discuss and disseminate information associated with the IRWMP to the stakeholders. It also states that data management will support statewide data needs with the agencies coordinating with the State through the CERES, SWAMP, and GAMA programs. Although statewide data needs would be addressed by annual reports that will be submitted to appropriate programs, these are neither detailed nor specific enough to fully satisfy the application requirements.

**STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 5**

**Comment:** Appropriate stakeholders are included in the planning process and have voiced their support of the project. Stakeholders have been active since October, 2004 through meetings and workshops which discussed the process, informed the public, and developed the mission and goals of the proposed IRWMP. Although the proposed IRWMP will address environmental justice concerns, this application is somewhat weak in its discussion of them.

**DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** The City of Watsonville is documented as being a DAC and will clearly benefit from the proposed IRWMP. They are also included as a stakeholder for the IRWM process. However, the water supply/quality needs of the DAC are not documented.

**RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 5**

**Comment:** Existing local planning documents that will form a foundation for the IRWMP are identified and it is indicated how these documents will relate to the IRWM management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of documents. A long list of key planning reports is supplied which were used in developing the IRWMP process. The IRWMP will be coordinated with various UWMPs.

**AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.**

**Score: 4**

**Comment:** The applicant has and will continue to coordinate efforts with local stakeholders and all relevant agencies. A table is provided which summarizes coordination/interaction with State, federal, and local agencies. The applicant has partially documented agency coordination issues. Issues associated with projects and plans that cross or impact other jurisdictions within the IRWMP are not addressed even though they are critical with regards to whether the project or IRWMP can be implemented.

**TOTAL SCORE: 73**